arXiv:quant-ph/0202002v6 3 Oct 2002

Exponents of quantum fixed-length pure state source coding

Masahito Hayashi[1,*]

[1]*Laboratory for Mathematical Neuroscience, Brain Science Institute,*
RIKEN, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan

(Dated: 12 May 2002)

We derive the optimal exponent of the error probability of the quantum fixed-length pure state source coding in both cases of blind coding and visible coding. The optimal exponent is universally attained by Jozsa et al. (PRL, **81**, 1714 (1998))'s universal code. In the direct part, a group representation theoretical type method is essential. In the converse part, Nielsen and Kempe (PRL, **86**, 5184 (2001))'s lemma is essential.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a,02.20.Qs

I. INTRODUCTION

As was proven by Schumacher [1], and Jozsa and Schumacher [2], we can compress the unknown source state into the coding length $nH(\overline{\rho}_p)$ with a sufficiently small error when the source state on n quantum systems obeys the n-independent identical distribution (i.i.d.) of the known probability p, where $\overline{\rho}_p := \sum_\rho p(\rho)\rho$ and $H(\rho)$ is the von Neumann entropy $-\operatorname{Tr}\rho\log\rho$. Jozsa and Schumacher's protocol depends on the mixture state $\overline{\rho}_p$, and in this protocol, the coding length is independent for the input. Therefore, this type code is called a *quantum fixed length source code.*

Concerning the quantum source coding, there are two criteria: One is the blind coding, in which the input is an unknown quantum state. The other is the visible coding, in which the input is classical information that determines the quantum state, i.e., the encoder knows the input quantum state. When a source consists of pure states and depends on an i.i.d. distribution of the probability p, the bound of the compression rate (i.e. the minimum admissible rate) equals the entropy rate $H(\overline{\rho}_p)$. The proof of this statement is divided into two parts: One is the possibility to compress the quantum source into a larger rate than the entropy rate, which is called the *direct part.* The other is the impossibility to compress the quantum source into a smaller rate than the entropy rate, which is called the *converse part.* The former is given by Schumacher's result. The latter was proven by Barnum et al. [3] only in the blind case, however Horodecki [4] proved it in both cases by a simpler method. Winter[5] proved that the both settings have the *strong converse* property, i.e. if we compress into a smaller rate than the entropy rate, the average error goes to 1. Moreover, depending only on the coding length nR, Jozsa et al. [6] constructed a code which is independent of the distribution which the input obeys. In their protocol, the average error tends to 0 when $H(\rho) < R$. Such a code is called a *quantum universal fixed-length source code.* Of course, we can consider a quantum variable-length source code, but discuss it in another paper [7].

However, only with the knowledge of the minimum admissible rate we cannot estimate what a compression rate is available for a given error $\delta > 0$ and a given integer n. For such an estimate, we need to discuss the decreasing speed of the average error for a fixed rate R. In the classical information theory, in order to treat this speed, we focus the exponential rate (exponent) of the error probability, and the optimal exponent is greater than zero when the coding rate R is greater than the entropy rate. Conversely, when the rate R is smaller than the entropy rate, the correct probability exponentially goes to zero. These optimal exponents have been already calculated by using type method. (see Csiszár and Körner [8]).

In this paper, we treat only a quantum fixed-length code at both criteria in the case where any source consists of pure states. We optimize the exponents of the average error and the average fidelity in sec. III. Using a group representation theoretical type method introduced in Appendix B, we derive an upper bound of the error of the quantum universal fixed-length source code constructed by Jozsa et al. for any n and any R as (20), (21) and (22) in sec. IV. This upper bound yields its attainability of the optimal exponents. In sec. VI, nonexistence of a code exceeding the exponents is proven, which is called the converse part. In the converse part, an inequality is essential and is proven from Nielsen and Kempe's lemma [9] in sec. V.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS RESULTS

Blind and visible codes are mathematically formulated as follows. Assume that a quantum pure state ρ_i on $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to label $i \in \Xi$ is generated with probability p_i . We denote the set of quantum states on $\mathcal{H}$ by $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore, the source is described by $\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}$. In the blind setting, the encoder is described by a CP map E from $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$, and the decoder is described by a CP map D from $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. The average error is given by $\epsilon(E,D) := \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i(1 - \operatorname{Tr} D\circ E(\rho_i)\rho_i)$, and the average fidelity is given by $\sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i \operatorname{Tr} D\circ E(\rho_i)\rho_i$. We

---

[*] Electronic address: masahito@brain.riken.go.jp

call a triple $(\mathcal{K}, E, D)$ a blind code.

In the visible setting, the encoder is described by a map F from Ξ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$. Then, the average error is given by $\epsilon(F, D) := \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i(1 - \operatorname{Tr} D \circ F(i)\rho_i)$. In this setting, we treat the trade-off between decreasing $\dim \mathcal{K}$ and $\epsilon(F, D)$. We call a triple $(\mathcal{K}, E, D)$ a blind code. Similarly, we call a triple $(\mathcal{K}, F, D)$ a visible code. In the both settings, we treat the trade-off between decreasing $\dim \mathcal{K}$ and $\epsilon(E, D)$ $(\epsilon(F, D))$.

A blind code $(\mathcal{K}, E, D)$ can be regarded as a visible code in the case where $F(i) := E(\rho_i)$. We have more choices in the visible setting than in the blind setting. A blind code is used for saving memories in quantum computing. A visible code is used for efficient use of quantum channel in quantum cryptography, for example, the B92 protocol [10], [11].

In the n-i.i.d. setting, the quantum state $\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} := \rho_{i_1} \otimes \rho_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{i_n}$ on the tensored Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ generates with the probability $p_{n,\vec{i}_n} := p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_n}$, where $\vec{i}_n = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_n)$. This setting is written by the source $\{\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}, p_{n,\vec{i}_n}\}_{\vec{i}_n \in \Xi^n}$, which is called a *n-discrete memoryless source* (DMS) generated by the source $\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}$. Now, we define the minimum admissible rate $R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ $(R_V(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}))$ and the converse minimum admissible rate $R_B^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ $(R_V^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}))$ of the DMS generated by $\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}$ in the blind setting (in the visible setting) as follows, respectively.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, E_n, D_n)\}, \\ \epsilon(E_n, D_n) \to 0 \end{array} \right\} \\
& R_V(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, F_n, D_n)\}, \\ \epsilon(F_n, D_n) \to 0 \end{array} \right\} \\
& R_B^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, E_n, D_n)\}, \\ \underline{\lim}\, \epsilon(E_n, D_n) < 1 \end{array} \right\} \\
& R_V^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, F_n, D_n)\}, \\ \underline{\lim}\, \epsilon(F_n, D_n) < 1 \end{array} \right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

The following theorem is a known result.

Theorem 1 *The equations*

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) = R_V(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) = R_B^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
& = R_V^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) = H(\overline{\rho}_p) \qquad (1)
\end{aligned}
$$

hold, where $\overline{\rho}_p := \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i \rho_i$ *and* $H(\rho)$ *denotes von Neumann entropy* $-\operatorname{Tr} \rho \log \rho$.

Since the following relations

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge R_V(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}), \\
R_B^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge R_V^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}), \\
R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge R_B^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}), \\
R_V(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge R_V^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})
\end{aligned}
$$

are trivial, it is sufficient for (1) to prove

$$
R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \le H(\rho), \quad R_V^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge H(\rho).
$$

Schumacher [1] proved the direct part: $R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \le H(\overline{\rho}_p)$, and Jozsa-Schumacher [2] simplified it. Barnum et al. [3] proved the weak converse part: $R_B(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge H(\overline{\rho}_p)$ of the blind case, and Horodecki [4] proved the weak converse part: $R_V(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge H(\overline{\rho}_p)$ of the visible case, which is a stronger argument than the one of the blind case. Winter [5] obtained the strong converse part: $R_V^-(\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge H(\overline{\rho}_p)$. Moreover, Petz and Mosonyi [12] treated the general stationary case, in which there are memory effects.

III. MAIN RESULTS

Next, we define the exponents of the average error (the reliable functions) $r_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ and $r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$, and the exponents of the average fidelity (the converse reliable functions) $r_{e,B}^*(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ and $r_{e,V}^*(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& r_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \sup\left\{ \underline{\lim} \frac{-1}{n} \log \epsilon(E_n, D_n) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, E_n, D_n)\}, \\ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \le R \end{array} \right\} \\
& r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \sup\left\{ \underline{\lim} \frac{-1}{n} \log \epsilon(F_n, D_n) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, F_n, D_n)\}, \\ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \le R \end{array} \right\} \\
& r_{e,B}^*(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim} \frac{-1}{n} \log(1 - \epsilon(E_n, D_n)) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, E_n, D_n)\}, \\ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \le R \end{array} \right\} \\
& r_{e,V}^*(R|\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\
:= & \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim} \frac{-1}{n} \log(1 - \epsilon(F_n, D_n)) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n, F_n, D_n)\}, \\ \overline{\lim} \frac{1}{n} \log \dim \mathcal{K}_n \le R \end{array} \right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

The following is the main theorem.

Theorem 2 *Assume that* $0 \le R < \log d$ *and* $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$. *We diagonalize* $\overline{\rho}_p$ *as* $\overline{\rho}_p = \sum_i a_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ *such that* $a_i \ge a_{i+1}$. *Then,* $\mathbf{a} := \{a_i\}$ *is a probability distribution on*

$\{1,\dots,d\}$. *The relations*

$$\begin{aligned} r_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &= r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ &= \max_{0<s\le 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} && (2)\\ &= \min_{H(\sigma)\ge R} D(\sigma\|\overline{\rho}_p) && (3)\\ &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) && (4)\\ r^*_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge r^*_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ &= \sup_{s\ge 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} && (5)\\ &= \min_{H(\sigma)\le R} D(\sigma\|\overline{\rho}_p) && (6)\\ &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\le R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) && (7) \end{aligned}$$

hold, where $\psi(s)$ *denotes the Rény entropy* $\log\operatorname{Tr}\overline{\rho}_p^s$, $D(\sigma\|\rho)$ *denotes the quantum relative entropy* $\operatorname{Tr}\sigma(\log\sigma-\log\rho)$, *and* $\mathbf{b}$ *denotes a probability on* $\{1,\dots,d\}$.

Our proof of Theorem 2 is outlined as follows. Since any blind code can be demonstrated as a visible code, the relations

$$r_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \le r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \qquad (8)$$

$$r^*_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge r^*_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \qquad (9)$$

are trivial. In sec.IV, we universally construct the optimal quantum fixed-length code with the rate R. This construction is independent of $\overline{\rho}_p$, and depends only on the rate R. From this construction, we obtain

$$r_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) \qquad (10)$$

$$r^*_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \le \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\le R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}), \qquad (11)$$

which is called the direct part. In sec. VI, we prove

$$r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \le \max_{0<s\le 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} \qquad (12)$$

$$r^*_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge \sup_{s\ge 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}, \qquad (13)$$

which is called the converse part. The equivalence between RHSs of (10),(12) and (3) ((11),(13) and (6)) is proven in Appendix A, respectively.

Remark 1 *The inequality* $r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge \min\{D(\sigma\|\rho)|H(\sigma)\le R\}$ *was proven by Winter [5].*

Remark 2 *We can adopt another criteria for error as:*

$$\epsilon_b(E,D) := \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i(1-\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr} D\circ F(\rho_i)\rho_i})$$

$$\epsilon_b(F,D) := \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i(1-\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr} D\circ F(i)\rho_i}).$$

Note that $(1-\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr} D\circ F(i)\rho_i}) = (1-\operatorname{Tr}|D\circ F(i)\rho_i|)$ *equals Bures distance. In this case, we can define other reliable functions* $r_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ *and* $r_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$, *and other converse reliable functions* $r^*_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ *and* $r^*_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi})$ *by*

$$\begin{aligned} & r_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ :=& \sup\left\{ \underline{\lim}\frac{-1}{n}\log\epsilon_b(E_n,D_n) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l}\exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n,E_n,D_n)\},\\ \overline{\lim}\frac{1}{n}\log\dim\mathcal{K}_n \le R\end{array} \right\} \\ & r_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ :=& \sup\left\{ \underline{\lim}\frac{-1}{n}\log\epsilon_b(F_n,D_n) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l}\exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n,F_n,D_n)\},\\ \overline{\lim}\frac{1}{n}\log\dim\mathcal{K}_n \le R\end{array} \right\} \\ & r^*_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ :=& \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim}\frac{-1}{n}\log(1-\epsilon_b(E_n,D_n)) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l}\exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n,E_n,D_n)\},\\ \overline{\lim}\frac{1}{n}\log\dim\mathcal{K}_n \le R\end{array} \right\} \\ & r^*_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ :=& \inf\left\{ \overline{\lim}\frac{-1}{n}\log(1-\epsilon_b(F_n,D_n)) \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l}\exists\{(\mathcal{K}_n,F_n,D_n)\},\\ \overline{\lim}\frac{1}{n}\log\dim\mathcal{K}_n \le R\end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As proven in Appendix C, the following relations between two criteria

$$r_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) = r_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \qquad (14)$$

$$r_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) = r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \qquad (15)$$

$$r^*_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge r^*_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \qquad (16)$$

$$r^*_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \ge r^*_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \qquad (17)$$

hold.

IV. CONSTRUCTION OF A UNIVERSAL FIXED-LENGTH SOURCE CODE TO ACHIEVE THE OPTIMAL RATE

We construct a universal quantum fixed-length source code to achieve the optimal rate in Theorem 2. For any $r>0$ and $R>0$, the set $\{\rho\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})|\min_{H(\sigma)\ge R}D(\sigma\|\rho)=r\}$ is covariant for the actions of the d-dimensional special unitary group $\mathrm{SU}(d)$, and any n-i.i.d. distribution p^n is invariant for the action of the n-th symmetric group S_n on the tensored space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. Thus, our code should satisfy the invariance for these actions on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$.

Now, we focus on the irreducible decomposition of the tensored space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ concerning the representations of S_n and $\mathrm{SU}(d)$, and define the Young index $\mathbf{n}$ as,

$$\mathbf{n} := (n_1,\dots,n_d), \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{d} n_i = n, n_i \ge n_{i+1},$$

and denote the set of Young indices $\mathbf{n}$ by Y_n. Young index $\mathbf{n}$ uniquely corresponds to the irreducible unitary representation of S_n and the one of $\mathrm{SU}(d)$. Now, we denote the representation space of the irreducible unitary representation of S_n ($\mathrm{SU}(d)$) corresponding to $\mathbf{n}$ by

$\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}}$ ($\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{n}}$), respectively. In particular, regarding a unitary representation of $\mathrm{SU}(d)$, Young index $\mathbf{n}$ gives the highest weight of the corresponding representation. Then, the tensored space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ is decomposed as follows; i.e. $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ is equivalent with the following direct sum space under the representation of S_n and $\mathrm{SU}(d)$.

$$\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{n}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{n}}, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{n}} := \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{n}} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}}.$$

Since this representation of the group $S_n \times \mathrm{SU}(d)$ is unitary, any irreducible components $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{n}}$ are orthogonal with one another. For details, see Weyl [13], Goodman and Wallach [14], and Iwahori [15]. The efficiency of this representation method was discussed from several viewpoints. Regarding fixed-length source coding, it was discussed by Jozsa et. al. [6]. Regarding quantum relative entropy, it was by Hayashi[16]. Regarding quantum hypothesis testing, it was by Hayashi[17]. Regarding estimation of spectrum, it was by Keyl and Werner[18].

Next, we construct a blind code with rate R. We define the Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}_{R,n}$, the blind encoder $E_{R,n}$, the visible encoder $F_{R,n}$ and the decoder $D_{R,n}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}_{R,n} :=& \bigoplus_{\mathbf{n}:H(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n})\le R} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{n}} \\
E_{R,n}(\rho) :=& P_{R,n}\rho P_{R,n} + \operatorname{Tr}\rho(I-P_{R,n})\frac{I_{\mathcal{K}_{R,n}}}{\operatorname{Tr} I_{\mathcal{K}_{R,n}}} \\
F_{R,n}(\vec{i}_n) :=& \frac{P_{R,n}\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}P_{R,n}}{\operatorname{Tr} P_{R,n}\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}P_{R,n}} \\
D_{R,n}(\rho) :=& \rho,
\end{aligned}$$

where we denote the projection to $\mathcal{K}_{R,n}$ by $P_{R,n}$.

Lemma 3 *We define R_n by*

$$R_n := R - \frac{4d}{n}\log(n+d). \tag{18}$$

The rates of the blind code $\{(\mathcal{K}_{R,n}, E_{R,n}, D_{R,n})\}$ and the visible code $\{(\mathcal{K}_{R,n}, F_{R,n}, D_{R,n})\}$ satisfies

$$\dim \mathcal{K}_{R_n,n} \le e^{nR}. \tag{19}$$

When the mixture $\overline{\rho}_p$ of the source is diagonalized as $\sum_{j=1}^d a_j|e_j\rangle\langle e_j|$, we can evaluate the average errors as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon(F_{R_n,n}, D_{R_n,n}) \\
\le& (n+d)^{4d}\exp\left(-n\min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R_n} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a})\right) \qquad (20)\\
&\epsilon(E_{R_n,n}, D_{R_n,n}) \\
\le& 2(n+d)^{4d}\exp\left(-n\min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R_n} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a})\right) \qquad (21)\\
&1-\epsilon(F_{R_n,n}, D_{R_n,n}) \\
\ge& (n+d)^{-\frac{d(d+1)}{2}}\exp\left(-n\min_{\mathbf{n}\in Y_n:H\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\le R_n} D\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\middle\|\mathbf{a}\right)\right), \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{a}$ is defined as $\mathbf{a} := \{a_i\}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \{b_i\}$ denotes a probability on $\{1,\dots,d\}$. Taking the limit, we obtain

$$\underline{\lim}\frac{-1}{n}\log\epsilon(E_{R_n,n}, D_{R_n,n}) \ge \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}), \tag{23}$$

$$\overline{\lim}\frac{-1}{n}\log(1-\epsilon(F_{R_n,n}, D_{R_n,n})) \le \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\le R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}). \tag{24}$$

Inequalities (23) and (24) imply (10) and (11), respectively. Conversely, the opposite inequalities of (23) and (24) are guaranteed by inequalities (12) and (13).

Remark 3 *The subspace $\mathcal{K}_{R_n,n}$ is equal to the subspace Υ introduced by Jozsa et al. [6] because both are invariant for the action of the symmetric group. Therefore, our code $E_{R_n,n}$ coincides with their protocol.*

Remark 4 *Even if the source states ρ_i are not pure, we can prove inequalities similar to (20), (21) and (22) by using some calculations similar to Appendix C in Hayashi and Matsumoto[7]. However, in this case, this exponent does not seem to be optimal.*

Proof of Lemma 3: Using Lemma 10, we can evaluate as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim\mathcal{K} &\le (n+1)^d \max_{\mathbf{n}\in Y_n:H\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\le R_n} \dim\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{n}} \\
&\le (n+1)^{2d} \max_{\mathbf{n}\in Y_n:H\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\le R_n} \dim\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}} \\
&\le (n+1)^{2d}(n+d)^{2d}e^{nR_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain (19). The average error of the visible code can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon(F_{R_n,n}, D_{R_n,n}) \\
=& \sum_{\vec{i}_n\in\Xi^n} p_{n,\vec{i}_n}\left(1-\operatorname{Tr}\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}\frac{P_{R_n,n}\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}P_{R_n,n}}{\operatorname{Tr} P_{R_n,n}\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}P_{R_n,n}}\right) \\
=& \sum_{\vec{i}_n\in\Xi^n} p_{n,\vec{i}_n}\left(1-\operatorname{Tr} P_{R_n,n}\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}\right) \\
=& \left(1-\operatorname{Tr} P_{R_n,n}\sum_{\vec{i}_n\in\Xi^n} p_{n,\vec{i}_n}\rho_{n,\vec{i}_n}\right) \\
=& \left(1-\operatorname{Tr} P_{R_n,n}\overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma 11 guarantees (20) and (22). Conversely,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon(E_{R_n,n}, D_{R_n,n}) \\
=& \sum_{\vec{i}_n \in \Xi^n} p_{n,\vec{i}_n} \Bigg[1 - \operatorname{Tr} \rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} \\
& \left(P_{R_n,n} \rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} P_{R_n,n} + \operatorname{Tr} \rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} (I - P_{R_n,n}) \frac{I_{\mathcal{K}_{R_n,n}}}{\operatorname{Tr} I_{\mathcal{K}_{R_n,n}}} \right) \Bigg] \\
\le& \sum_{\vec{i}_n \in \Xi^n} p_{n,\vec{i}_n} \left(1 - \operatorname{Tr} \rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} P_{R_n,n} \rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} P_{R_n,n} \right) \\
=& \sum_{\vec{i}_n \in \Xi^n} p_{n,\vec{i}_n} \left(1 - (\operatorname{Tr} \rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} P_{R_n,n})^2 \right) \\
\le& \left(1 - \left(\sum_{\vec{i}_n \in \Xi^n} p_{n,\vec{i}_n} \operatorname{Tr} \rho_{n,\vec{i}_n} P_{R_n,n} \right)^2 \right) \\
=& 1 - \left(\operatorname{Tr} \overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n} P_{R_n,n} \right)^2 \le 2 \left(1 - \operatorname{Tr} \overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n} P_{R_n,n} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (21). ■

V. NECESSARY INEQUALITY FOR THE CONVERSE PART

For an Hermitian matrix X, we define the projections $\{X \ge 0\}, \{X < 0\}$ by

$$\{X \ge 0\} = \sum_{s_j \ge 0} E_j, \quad \{X < 0\} = \sum_{s_j < 0} E_j,$$

where the spectral decomposition of X is given by $X = \sum_j s_j E_j$ (s_j is an eigenvalue corresponding to projection E_j). Under a source $\{\rho_i, p_i\}_{i \in \Xi}$, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 4 *Any visible code $(\mathcal{K}, F, D)$ satisfies the following inequalities*

$$\epsilon(F, D) + e^{\lambda} \dim \mathcal{K} \ge \operatorname{Tr} \overline{\rho}_p \{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda} < 0\} \tag{25}$$

$$1 - \epsilon(F, D) \le e^{\lambda} \dim \mathcal{K} + \operatorname{Tr} \overline{\rho}_p \{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda} \ge 0\} \tag{26}$$

for $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

Moreover, the inequality

$$1 - \epsilon(F, D) \le e^{\lambda} \dim \mathcal{K} + e^{(1-s)\lambda + \psi(s)} \tag{27}$$

holds for $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \forall s \ge 1$.

For our proof of the above lemma, we require the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5 *The set of visible encoders from Ξ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$ coincides with the convex hull of the set of extremal points, which equals*

$$\{ F \,| F(i) \text{ is a pure state } \forall i \in \Xi \}. \tag{28}$$

Proof: If a visible encoder F satisfies that $f(i)$ is a pure state for any $i \in \Xi$, then F is an extremal point. It is sufficient to show that for any visible encoder $F(i) = \sum_{j_i} s_{j_i} |\phi_{j_i}\rangle\langle\phi_{j_i}|$ is written by a convex hull of (28). A visible encoder $F(j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_n)$ defined by

$$F(j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_n | i) = |\phi_{j_i}\rangle\langle\phi_{j_i}|$$

belongs to (28). Since the relation $F = \sum_{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_n} s_{j_1} s_{j_2} \cdots s_{j_n} F(j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_n)$ holds, we obtain the lemma. ■

Lemma 6 *The set of decoders from $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ coincides with the convex hull of the subset*

$$\left\{ D \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists a Hilbert space } \mathcal{H}' \text{ and} \\ \text{an isometry } T \text{ from } \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}) \text{ to } \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}') \\ \text{such that } D(\rho) = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}'} T(\rho). \end{array} \right\}. \tag{29}$$

Proof: From the Steinspring representation theorem, there exist a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}'$ and a unitary U on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}' \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and an element $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}' \otimes \mathcal{H})$ such that

$$D(\rho) = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}'} U \rho \otimes \rho_0 U^*, \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}).$$

Assume that $\rho_0 = \sum_j s_j |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|$. Then, the decoder D_j:

$$D_j(\rho) = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}'} U \rho \otimes |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j| U^*, \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K})$$

belongs to (29). Since $D = \sum_j s_j D_j$, the proof is complete. ■

For a proof of Lemma 4, an entanglement viewpoint plays a essential role. A state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ is called separable if there exist states $\rho_{A,i} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A), \rho_{B,i} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and a probability p_i such that

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_{A,i} \otimes \rho_{B,i}.$$

The following lemma was proven from the viewpoint of entanglement by Nielsen and Kempe [9].

Lemma 7 *When the state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ is separable, the inequality*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\{\operatorname{Tr} P\rho_A | P : \textit{ projection on } \mathcal{H}_A, \operatorname{rank} P = k\} \\
\ge&\max\{\operatorname{Tr} P\rho | P : \textit{ projection on } \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B, \operatorname{rank} P = k\}
\end{aligned}$$

holds for any integer k, where $\rho_A := \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \rho$.

Proof of Lemma 4: From Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, it is sufficient to show the inequalities (25), (26) and (27) for the pair an encoder F belonging to (28) and a decoder D belonging to (29). Assume that the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}'$ satisfies that $D(\rho) = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}'} T(\rho)$. The state $\rho_i' := \frac{\rho_i \otimes I \, T(F(i)) \rho_i \otimes I}{\operatorname{Tr} T(F(i)) \rho_i \otimes I} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}')$ is pure and satisfies that $\operatorname{Tr} D(F(i)) \rho_i = \operatorname{Tr} T(F(i)) \rho_i \otimes I = \operatorname{Tr} T(F(i)) \rho_i'$. Since $\operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}'} \rho_i' = \rho_i$, there exists a pure state $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}')$ such that $\rho_i' = \rho_i \otimes \sigma_i$. Since the state $\overline{\rho}_p' := \sum_{i \in \Xi} p_i \rho_i' =$

$\sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i\rho_i\otimes\sigma_i$ is separable and $\overline{\rho}_p = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}\overline{\rho}'_p$, Lemma 7 guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned}&\max\{\mathrm{Tr}\,P\overline{\rho}'_p|P:\ \text{projection on } \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}', \mathrm{rank}\,P=\dim\mathcal{K}\}\\ \le&\max\{\mathrm{Tr}\,P\overline{\rho}_p|P:\ \text{projection on } \mathcal{H}, \mathrm{rank}\,P=\dim\mathcal{K}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Since $I \ge F(i)$, we have $T(I)\ge T(F(i))$. The relations

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i\,\mathrm{Tr}\,D(F(i))\rho_i &= \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i\,\mathrm{Tr}\,T(F(i))\rho'_i\\ \le \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i\,\mathrm{Tr}\,T(I)\rho'_i &= \mathrm{Tr}\,T(I)\overline{\rho}'_p\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

hold. The relations $I\ge T(I)\ge 0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}\,T(I)=\mathrm{Tr}\,I_{\mathcal{K}}=\dim\mathcal{K}$ imply that

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,T(I)\overline{\rho}'_p \le \max\left\{\mathrm{Tr}\,P\overline{\rho}'_p \left| \begin{array}{l} P:\ \text{projection on } \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}',\\ \mathrm{rank}\,P=\dim\mathcal{K}\end{array}\right.\right\}. \tag{32}$$

Assume that P is a projection on $\mathcal{H}$ whose rank is $\dim\mathcal{K}$, then

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda})P \le \mathrm{Tr}(\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda})\{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda}\ge 0\}.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p P \le e^{\lambda}\dim\mathcal{K} + \mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p\{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda}\ge 0\}. \tag{33}$$

From (30), (31), (32) and (33),

$$\begin{aligned}1-\epsilon(F,D) &= \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i\,\mathrm{Tr}\,D(F(i))\rho_i\\ \le&\max\{\mathrm{Tr}\,P\overline{\rho}'_p|P:\ \text{projection on } \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}', \mathrm{rank}\,P=\dim\mathcal{K}\}\\ \le&\max\{\mathrm{Tr}\,P\overline{\rho}_p|P:\ \text{projection on } \mathcal{H}, \mathrm{rank}\,P=\dim\mathcal{K}\}\\ \le& e^{\lambda}\dim\mathcal{K} + \mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p\{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda}\ge 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

We obtain (26). Since $\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p\{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda} < 0\} = 1 - \mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p\{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda}\ge 0\}$, the inequalities (25) and (26) hold. Applying Markov inequality (E1) given in Appendix E to the probability $\mathbf{a}=\{a_i\}$ and the random variable a_i^t, we obtain the inequality

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p\{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda}\ge 0\} \le e^{-t\lambda}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p^{\,1+t} \quad \forall t\ge 0,$$

where $a_1,\ldots,a_d$ are eigenvalues of $\overline{\rho}_p$. Substituting $1+t$ for s, we obtain (27). ■

Remark 5 *Assume that D is not a CP map but a positive map. In this case, the inequality*

$$1-\epsilon(F,D) \le 2e^{\lambda}\dim\mathcal{K} + 2\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p\{\overline{\rho}_p - e^{\lambda}\ge 0\} \tag{34}$$

holds for $\forall\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ instead of (26). This inequality is proven in Appendix D.

VI. PROOF OF THE CONVERSE PART OF THEOREM 2

First, using Lemma 4, we prove inequality (12).

$$r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \le \max_{0\le s\le 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}. \tag{35}$$

Assume that a sequence of visible codes $\{(\mathcal{K}_n,F_n,D_n)\}$ satisfies that

$$\overline{\lim}\,\frac{1}{n}\log\dim\mathcal{K}_n \le R. \tag{36}$$

It follows from (25) in Lemma 4 that

$$\epsilon(F_n,D_n) \ge \mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n}\{\overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n} - e^{-nS}\le 0\} - e^{-nS}\dim\mathcal{K}_n.$$

When $S-R\ge\eta(S) := \overline{\lim}\,\frac{-1}{n}\log\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n}\{\overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n} - e^{-nS}\le 0\}$,

$$\overline{\lim}\,-\frac{1}{n}\log\epsilon(F_n,D_n)\le\eta(S).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\lim}\,-\frac{1}{n}\log\epsilon(F_n,D_n) &\le \inf\{\eta(S)|S-R\ge\eta(S)\}\\ &= \inf\{\eta(S)|S-\eta(S)\ge R\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, applying (E4) to the random variable $-\log a_i$ under the probability distribution $\mathbf{a}$, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{lll}\eta(S) & = (1-s(S))-\psi(s(S)) & \text{if } H(\rho)\le S\le -\psi'(0)\\ \eta(S) & \ge \eta(-\psi'(0)) & \text{if } S > -\psi'(0)\\ \eta(S) & = 0 & \text{if } S < H(\rho),\end{array}$$

where the definition of $s(S)$ is given in Lemma 8 in Appendix A. When $H(\rho) < S < -\psi'(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\eta(S)}{dS} &= 1-s(S)\ge 0\\ \frac{d(S-R-\eta(S))}{dS} &= s(S)\ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

When $H(\rho) < R < \log d = \psi(0) = -\psi'(0)-\eta(-\psi'(0))$, we obtain

$$\inf\{\eta(S)|S-\eta(S)\ge R\} = \eta(S_R) = S_R - R.$$

When $0\le R\le H(\rho)$, we obtain

$$\inf\{\eta(S)|S-\eta(S)\ge R\} \le \inf\{\eta(S)|S\ge H(\rho)\} = 0.$$

Using Lemma 9, we obtain (12).

Next, we prove (13). Assume that a sequence of visible codes $\{(\mathcal{K}_n,F_n,D_n)\}$ satisfies that

$$\overline{\lim}\,\frac{1}{n}\log\dim\mathcal{K}_n \le R. \tag{37}$$

When $H(\rho) \le R$, it is trivial that

$$\underline{\lim} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \epsilon(F_n, D_n)) \ge S_{H(\rho)} - H(\rho) = 0.$$

Lemma 9 implies (13).

Assume that $a_1 = a_k > a_{k+1}$ and $\log k < R < H(\rho)$. Since $\log \operatorname{Tr}(\overline{\rho}_p^{\otimes n})^s = n\psi(s)$, substituting $\lambda := -nS_R$ and $s := s(S_R) \ge 1$ into (27), we have

$$1 - \epsilon(F_n, D_n) \le e^{-n(S_R - R)} + e^{-n(S_R(1-s(S_R)) - \psi(s(S_R)))}. \tag{38}$$

Note that the definitions of $S_R, s(S)$ are given in Lemma 8. Since $S_R - R = S_R(1 - s(S_R)) - \psi(s(S_R))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\lim} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \epsilon(F_n, D_n)) &\ge S_R - R \\ &= \frac{(1 - s(S_R))R + \psi(s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}, \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where the last inequality follows from $S_R = \frac{R + \psi(s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}$ obtained from (A2). From Lemma 9, we obtain (13).

Assume that $0 \le R \le \log k$. Substituting $\lambda := -n(-\log a_1 - \epsilon)$ into (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - \epsilon(F_n, D_n) \\ \le& e^{-n(-\log a_1 - \epsilon - R)} + e^{-n((-\log a_1 - \epsilon)(1-s) - \psi(s))} \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

for $\forall \epsilon > 0$ and $\forall s \ge 1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{s \to \infty} (-\log a_1 - \epsilon)(1 - s) - \psi(s) \\ =& \lim_{s \to \infty} \epsilon(s - 1) - \log \frac{k a_1^s}{\sum_{i=1}^d a_i^s} - \log a_1 + \log k = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\underline{\lim} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \epsilon(F_n, D_n)) \ge -\log a_1 - \epsilon - R.$$

Arbitrarity of $\epsilon > 0$ implies

$$\underline{\lim} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - \epsilon(F_n, D_n)) \ge -\log a_1 - R.$$

Lemma 9 implies (13).

VII. DISCUSSION

When the source ρ_i is mixed and has no trivial redundancies, Koashi and Imoto [19] proved that the bound R_B equals $H(\rho)$ in the blind case. Lemma 3 holds for the mixed case. However, its optimality is not proven in the sense of exponents in the mixed case. In this case it may not be optimal.

It is interesting that our exponent corresponds to the exponents of the variable-length universal entanglement concentration given by Hayashi and Matsumoto[20] and the fixed-length entanglement concentration given by Hayashi et. al.[21]. However, our error exponent corresponds to the success exponent of [20], and our fidelity exponent corresponds to the failure exponents of [20] and [21]. Note that in [21] the optimal exponent r is given as the function of the rate R while in this paper and [20], the rate R is given as a function the optimal exponent r. In addition, in quantum hypothesis testing, an error exponent similar to (2) is given in Ogawa and Hayashi[22].

Acknowledgment

The author is grateful to Dr. A. Winter for advice on Nielsen and Kempe's paper [9]. He acknowledges stimulating discussions with Professor H. Nagaoka, Professor K. Matsumoto and Dr. T. Ogawa. He, also, thanks an anonymous referee for useful comments.

APPENDIX A: EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN DIFFERENT CHARACTERIZATIONS

In the classical case, the exponent has two forms [8][23][24]. Following Ogawa and Nagaoka [25], we prove this equivalence in the quantum source coding case. In this section we treat a state $\rho := \sum_i a_i |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$, and the function $\psi(s) := \log \operatorname{Tr} \rho^s$, where $a_i \ge a_{i+1}$. We assume that $a_1 = a_k > a_{k+1}$ and $d = \dim \mathcal{H}$.

Lemma 8 *If* $-\log a_1 < S \le -\psi'(0)$ *and* $\log k < R < \log d$*, we can uniquely define* $s(S) \ge 0$ *and* S_R *such that*

$$S = -\psi'(s(S)), \tag{A1}$$

$$R = s(S_R) S_R + \psi(s(S_R)). \tag{A2}$$

Conversely, when $R \le \log k$*,*

$$R < -s\psi'(s) + \psi(s). \tag{A3}$$

Proof: Since

$$\psi''(s) = \frac{\operatorname{Tr}(\log \rho)^2 \rho^s \operatorname{Tr} \rho^s - (\operatorname{Tr}(\log \rho)\rho^s)^2}{(\operatorname{Tr} \rho^s)^2} > 0 \tag{A4}$$

for $s > 0$, the function $-\psi'(s)$ is monotone decreasing. Because $\lim_{s \to \infty} -\psi'(s) = \log a_1$, $s(S)$ is uniquely defined in $(-\log a_1, -\psi'(0)]$.

When $S \in (-\log a_1, -\psi'(0)]$, we can calculate

$$\frac{d}{dS} s(S)S + \psi(s(S)) = s(S) > 0.$$

As shown latter, the equation

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} -\psi'(s)s + \psi(s) = \log k. \tag{A5}$$

holds. Since

$$-\psi'(0)0 + \psi(0) = \psi(0) = d,$$

S_R also is uniquely defined. The inequality $\frac{d}{ds}(-s\psi'(s)+\psi(s)) = -s\psi''(s) \le 0$ yields (A3).

Finally, we show (A5). We calculate as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\psi'(s)s+\psi(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} -s\log a_i \frac{a_i^s}{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s} + \log \sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i^s \\
=&-\sum_{i=k+1}^{d} s\frac{a_i^s}{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}\log a_i + \log\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j^s - \log k a_1^s \\
&+\left(-ks\frac{a_1^s}{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}\log a_1 + s\log a_1\right) + \log k \\
=&-\sum_{i=k+1}^{d} s\frac{a_i^s}{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}\log a_i + \log\frac{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}{k a_1^s} \\
&+ s\frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^d a_i^s}{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}\log a_1 + \log k.
\end{aligned}
$$

The terms $\frac{a_i^s}{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}$ and $\frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^d a_i^s}{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}$ exponentially go to 0 as $s \to \infty$. The term $\frac{\sum_{j=1}^d a_j^s}{k a_1^s}$ goes to 1. Thus, we obtain (A5).

■

Lemma 9 *When $\log k < R < \log d$, the equations*

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_R - R &= S_R(1-s(S_R)) - \psi(s(S_R)) && \text{(A6)}\\
&= \frac{(1-s(S_R))R - \psi(s(S_R))}{s(S_R)} && \text{(A7)}\\
&= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})=R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)=R} D(\sigma\|\rho) && \text{(A8)}
\end{aligned}
$$

hold, where σ is a state on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ is a probability on $\{1,\dots,d\}$. When $0 \le R \le \log k$, the equations

$$
\min_{H(\mathbf{b})=R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)=R} D(\sigma\|\rho) = -\log a_1 - R. \quad \text{(A9)}
$$

hold. When $H(\rho) < R < \log d$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_R - R &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)\ge R} D(\sigma\|\rho) && \text{(A10)}\\
&= \max_{0<s\le 1} \frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} && \text{(A11)}\\
0 &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\le R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)\le R} D(\sigma\|\rho) && \text{(A12)}\\
&= \max_{s\ge 1} \frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}. && \text{(A13)}
\end{aligned}
$$

When $\log k < R < H(\rho)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)\ge R} D(\sigma\|\rho) && \text{(A14)}\\
&= \max_{0<s\le 1} \frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} && \text{(A15)}\\
S_R - R &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\le R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)\le R} D(\sigma\|\rho) && \text{(A16)}\\
&= \max_{s\ge 1} \frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}. && \text{(A17)}
\end{aligned}
$$

When $0 \le R \le \log k$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\ge R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)\ge R} D(\sigma\|\rho) && \text{(A18)}\\
&= \max_{0<s\le 1} \frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} && \text{(A19)}\\
\log a_1 - R &= \min_{H(\mathbf{b})\le R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}) = \min_{H(\sigma)\le R} D(\sigma\|\rho) && \text{(A20)}\\
&= \sup_{s\ge 1} \frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}. && \text{(A21)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof: Equation (A6) follows from (A2). Equation (A2) yields

$$
S_R = \frac{R - \psi(s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}.
$$

Substituting the above equation into $S_R - R$, we obtain (A7). We prove (A8). Assume that $\log k < R < \log d$. Letting $\rho_s := \frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}$, we calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
&D(\sigma\|\rho) - D(\rho_s\|\rho)\\
=&\operatorname{Tr}\sigma(\log\sigma - \log\rho) - \operatorname{Tr}\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\left(\log\left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right) - \log\rho\right)\\
=&\operatorname{Tr}\sigma\left(\log\sigma - \log\left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right)\right)\\
&+\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma - \left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right)\right)\left(\log\left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right) - \log\rho\right)\\
=&D(\sigma\|\rho_s) - (1-s)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma - \left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right)\right)\log\rho\\
&-H(\sigma) + H(\rho_s)\\
=&\operatorname{Tr}\sigma\left(\log\sigma - \log\left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right)\right)\\
&+\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma - \left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right)\right)\log\left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right)\\
=&D(\sigma\|\rho_s) + s\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma - \left(\frac{\rho^s}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho^s}\right)\right)\log\rho.
\end{aligned}
$$

Equation (A2) guarantees that $H(\rho_{s(S_R)}) = R$. Assuming that $H(\sigma) = R$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{D(\sigma\|\rho_{s(S_R)})}{s(S_R)} = -\operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma - \rho_{s(S_R)}\right)\log\rho\\
=&\frac{1}{1-s(S_R)}\left(D(\sigma\|\rho) - D(\rho_{s(S_R)}\|\rho) - D(\sigma\|\rho_{s(S_R)})\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.,

$$
D(\sigma\|\rho) - D(\rho_{s(S_R)}\|\rho) = \frac{1}{s(S_R)} D(\sigma\|\rho_{s(S_R)}) \ge 0.
$$

It implies that

$$
D(\rho_{s(S_R)}\|\rho) = \min_{H(\sigma)=R} D(\sigma\|\rho) = \min_{H(\mathbf{b})=R} D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a}).
$$

Note that ρ_s is commutative with ρ. Equation (A2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{s(S_R)}\|\rho) =&\psi'(s(S_R))(1-s(S_R))-\psi(s(S_R)) \\ =&S_R(1-s(S_R))-\psi(s(S_R)). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain (A8).

Next, we proceed (A9) and assume that $0 \le R \le \log k$. When $H(\sigma)=R$,

$$\begin{aligned} &D(\sigma\|\rho)=\operatorname{Tr}\sigma\log\sigma+\operatorname{Tr}\sigma(-\log\rho) \\ \ge& -H(\sigma)+\operatorname{Tr}\sigma(-\log a_1)=-\log a_1-R. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{c} := \{c_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a probability whose entropy is R. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(\sum_{i=1}^k c_i|e_i\rangle\langle e_i| \middle\| \rho\right) =& \sum_{i=1}^k c_i(\log c_i-\log a_1) \\ =&-\log a_1-R. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain (A9), which implies (A20).

Taking the derivative with respect to R in (A2), we have

$$\frac{d}{dR}s(S_R)=\frac{-1}{s(S_R)\psi''(s(S_R))}<0. \tag{A22}$$

From (A1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dR}(S_R-R)=-\psi''(s(S_R))\frac{d}{dR}s(S_R)-1=\frac{1-s(S_R)}{s(S_R)}. \\ &\frac{d}{dR}(S_R-R)=\frac{1}{s^3(S_R)}\psi''(s(S_R))>0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the function $R\mapsto S_R-R$ is convex, and $\frac{d}{dR}(S_R-R)=0$ if and only if $s(S_R)=1$, i.e. $R=H(\rho)$. The function takes minimum value 0 at $R=H(\rho)$ because $S_{H(\rho)}-H(\rho)=0$. Therefore, we obtain (A10), (A12), (A14), (A16), and (A18).

Next, we discuss the other forms described by ψ. We can calculate the derivatives as

$$\frac{d}{ds}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}=\frac{-R-s\psi'(s)+\psi(s)}{s^2} \tag{A23}$$

$$\frac{d}{ds}(-R-s\psi'(s)+\psi(s))=-s\psi''(s)\le 0, \tag{A24}$$

where the last inequality follows from (A4). In (A24) and (A4), the equalities hold if and only if $s=0$.

Assume $\log k<R<\log d$. Since it follows from (A1) and (A2) that

$$-R-s(S_R)\psi'(s(S_R))+\psi(s(S_R))=0, \tag{A25}$$

the equation

$$\max_{s>0}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}=\frac{(1-s(S_R))R+\psi(s(S_R))}{s(S_R)}$$

holds. Relation (A22) implies that the function $R\mapsto s(S_R)$ strictly monotonically decreases, and $s(S_R)\ge 1$ if and only if $R\le H(\rho)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{0<s\le 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} \\ =&\begin{cases} \frac{(1-s(S_R))R+\psi(s(S_R))}{s(S_R)} & \text{if } H(\rho)<R<\log d \\ 0 & \text{if } \log k<R\le H(\rho) \end{cases} \\ &\max_{s\ge 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} \\ =&\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } H(\rho)<R<\log d \\ \frac{(1-s(S_R))R+\psi(s(S_R))}{s(S_R)} & \text{if } \log k<R\le H(\rho) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{(1-1)R-\psi(1)}{1}=0$. We obtain (A11), (A13), (A15) and (A17).

When $0\le R\le\log k$, Lemma 8 guarantees that the RHS of (A23) is positive for any $s>0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s>0}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}=&\lim_{s\to\infty}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s} \\ =&-\log a_1-R, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{0<s\le 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}=&0 \\ \sup_{s\ge 1}\frac{(1-s)R-\psi(s)}{s}=&-\log a_1-R. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain (A15) and (A21). ■

APPENDIX B: REPRESENTATION THEORETICAL TYPE METHODS

In this section, we prove the following two lemmas used in our proof of Lemma 3. We assume that $\rho=\sum_{i=1}^d a_i|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$ and d is the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$.

Lemma 10 *The relations*

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp\left(nH\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\right)(n+d)^{-\frac{d(d+1)}{2}} \\ &\le\dim\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}} \qquad \text{(B1)} \\ &\le(n+d)^{2d}\exp\left(nH\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\right) \qquad \text{(B2)} \\ \#\{\mathbf{n}|\mathbf{n}\in Y_n\}\le&(n+1)^d \qquad \text{(B3)} \\ \dim\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{n}}\le&(n+1)^d \qquad \text{(B4)} \end{aligned}$$

hold, where $C(\mathbf{n})$ is defined as

$$C(\mathbf{n}):=\frac{n!}{n_1!n_2!\dots n_d!}.$$

Proof: Inequality (B3) is trivial. Using Young index $\mathbf{n}$, the basis of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{n}}$ is described by $\{e_{\mathbf{n}'}\}_{\mathbf{n}'\in Y^{\mathbf{n}}}$, where the set $Y^{\mathbf{n}}$ is defined as

$$Y^{\mathbf{n}} := \left\{ \mathbf{n}' = \{n'_i\} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \sum_i n'_i = \sum_i n_i, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m n'_{s(i)} \le \sum_{i=1}^m n_i, \\ 1 \le \forall m \le d-1, \\ s \text{ is any permutation} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus, we obtain (B4). Note that the correspondence $\mathbf{n}'$ and $e_{\mathbf{n}'}$ depends on the choice of Cartan subalgebra, i.e. the choice of basis of $\mathcal{H}$.

According to Weyl [13], and Iwahori [15], the following equation holds and is evaluated as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dim \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}} \\
=&\frac{n!}{(n_1+d-1)!(n_2+d-2)!\dots n_d!}\prod_{j>i}(n_i-n_j-i+j) \\
\le&\frac{n!}{n_1!n_2!\dots n_d!}\prod_{j>i}(n_i-n_j-i+j) \\
\le&C(\mathbf{n})(n+d)^{2d} \qquad\qquad \text{(B5)} \\
\le&(n+d)^{2d}\exp\left(nH\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain (B2). As an opposite inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dim \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}} \\
\ge&\frac{n!}{(n_1+d-1)!(n_2+d-2)!\dots n_d!} \\
\ge&\frac{n!}{n_1!n_2!\dots n_d!}\left(\frac{1}{n+d}\right)^{d-1}\left(\frac{1}{n+d}\right)^{d-2}\cdots\left(\frac{1}{n+d}\right)^{0} \\
=&C(\mathbf{n})\left(\frac{1}{n+d}\right)^{\frac{d(d-1)}{2}} \ge \exp\left(nH\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\right)(n+d)^{-\frac{d(d+1)}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from

$$C(\mathbf{n}) \ge \frac{1}{(n+1)^d}\exp\left(nH\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\right),$$

which is easily proven by the type method [8]. We obtain (B1). ■

The following is essentially equivalent to Keyl and Werner's result [18]. For the reader's convenience, we give a simpler proof.

Lemma 11 *The following relations*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(n+d)^{-\frac{d(d+1)}{2}}\exp\left(-nD\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\middle\|\mathbf{a}\right)\right) \\
\le&\operatorname{Tr} P_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n} \qquad\qquad \text{(B6)} \\
\le&(n+d)^{3d}\exp\left(-nD\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\middle\|\mathbf{a}\right)\right) \qquad\qquad \text{(B7)} \\
&(n+d)^{-\frac{d(d+1)}{2}}\exp\left(-n\min_{\mathbf{n}\in n\mathcal{R}\cap Y_n}D\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\middle\|\mathbf{a}\right)\right) \\
\le&\sum_{\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\in\mathcal{R}}\operatorname{Tr} P_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n} \qquad\qquad \text{(B8)} \\
\le&(n+d)^{4d}\exp\left(-n\inf_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{R}}D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a})\right), \qquad\qquad \text{(B9)}
\end{aligned}$$

hold, where $\mathcal{R}$ is a subset consisting of probabilities on $\{1,\dots,d\}$ and we denote the projection to $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{n}}$ by $P_{\mathbf{n}}$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{U}'_{\mathbf{n}}$ be an irreducible representation of $SU(d)$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$, which is equivalent to $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{n}}$. We denote its projection by $P'_{\mathbf{n}}$. Now, we choose the basis $\{e_{\mathbf{n}'}\}_{\mathbf{n}'\in Y^{\mathbf{n}}}$ of $\mathcal{U}'_{\mathbf{n}}$ depending the basis $\{e_i\}$ of $\mathcal{H}$. The base $e_{\mathbf{n}'}$ is the eigenvector of $\rho^{\otimes n}$ with the eigenvalue $\prod_{i=1}^d a_i^{n'_i}$. Since $\mathbf{n}'$ is majorized by $\mathbf{n}$, we can calculate the operator norm by

$$\left\|P'_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n}P'_{\mathbf{n}}\right\| = \prod_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i}, \qquad\qquad \text{(B10)}$$

where $\|X\| := \sup_{x\in\mathcal{H}}\|Xx\|$. from (B4), (B5) and (B10), the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Tr} P_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n} &= \dim\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}} \times \operatorname{Tr} P'_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n} \le (n+d)^{3d}C(\mathbf{n})\prod_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i} \\
&= (n+d)^{3d}\mathrm{Mul}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{n})
\end{aligned}$$

hold, where we denote the multinomial distribution of $\mathbf{a}$ by $\mathrm{Mul}(\mathbf{a},\bullet)$. Inequality (B3) guarantees

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{(n+1)^d}\exp\left(-nD\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\middle\|\mathbf{a}\right)\right) &\le \mathrm{Mul}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{n}) \\
&\le \exp\left(-nD\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\middle\|\mathbf{a}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain inequality (B7). Inequality (B3) guarantees that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in n\mathcal{R}\cap Y_n}\operatorname{Tr} P_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n} \le (n+d)^{4d}\exp\left(-n\inf_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{R}}D(\mathbf{b}\|\mathbf{a})\right),$$

which implies inequality (B9). From (B10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Tr} P_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n} = \dim\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{n}}\operatorname{Tr} P'_{\mathbf{n}}\rho^{\otimes n} \\
\ge&\exp\left(nH\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\right)\right)(n+d)^{-\frac{d(d+1)}{2}}\prod_{i=1}^d a_i^{n_i} \\
=&(n+d)^{-\frac{d(d+1)}{2}}\exp\left(-nD\left(\frac{\mathbf{n}}{n}\middle\|\mathbf{a}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain inequalities (B6) and (B8). ■

APPENDIX C: PROOF OF (14), (15), (16) AND (17)

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon(F,D) &= \sum_{i\in\Xi}p_i(1-\operatorname{Tr} D\circ F(i)\rho_i) \\
&\ge \sum_{i\in\Xi}p_i(1-\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr} D\circ F(i)\rho_i}) = \epsilon_b(F,D),
\end{aligned}$$

the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} r_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge r_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ r^*_{e,V}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge r^*_{e,V,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \end{aligned} \tag{C1}$$

hold. Similarly, we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge r_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) \\ r^*_{e,B}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}) &\ge r^*_{e,B,b}(R|\{\rho_i,p_i\}_{i\in\Xi}). \end{aligned}$$

Using Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon(F_n,D_n) &= \sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i(1-\operatorname{Tr} D_n\circ F_n(i)\rho_i) \\ &\le 1-\left(\sum_{i\in\Xi} p_i\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr} D_n\circ F_n(i)\rho_i}\right)^2 \\ &= 1-(1-\epsilon_b(F_n,D_n))^2 \le 2\epsilon_b(F_n,D_n) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the opposite inequality from (C1) and then obtain (15). Similarly, we can prove (14).

APPENDIX D: PROOF OF (34)

For any visible code $(\mathcal{K},F,D)$, we define an operator T by $T := \{D(I)-1\le 0\}D(I)\{D(I)-1\le 0\}+\{D(I)-1>0\}$. The operator inequality

$$P\rho P+(I-P)\rho(I-P)\ge \frac{1}{2}\rho \tag{D1}$$

holds for any projection P. It is sufficient for (D1) to show the pure state case. The pure state case of (D1) is directly proven using the inequality $2(|x|^2+|y|^2)\ge |x+y|^2$ for any two complex numbers x,y. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{D(I)-1\le 0\}D(F(i))\{D(I)-1\le 0\} \\ &\quad+\{D(I)-1>0\}D(F(i))\{D(I)-1>0\} \\ \ge&\frac{1}{2}D(F(i)). \end{aligned} \tag{D2}$$

The inequality $D(I)\ge D(F(i))$ follows from the inequality $I\ge F(i)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{D(I)-1\le 0\}D(I)\{D(I)-1\le 0\} \\ \ge&\{D(I)-1\le 0\}D(F(i))\{D(I)-1\le 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{D3}$$

From the relations $\operatorname{Tr} D(F(i))=1$ and $D(F(i))\ge 0$, we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} &\{D(I)-1>0\} \\ \ge&\{D(I)-1>0\}D(F(i))\{D(I)-1>0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{D4}$$

It follows from (D3) and (D4) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{D(I)-1\le 0\}D(I)\{D(I)-1\le 0\}+\{D(I)-1>0\} \\ \ge&\{D(I)-1\le 0\}D(F(i))\{D(I)-1\le 0\} \\ &\quad+\{D(I)-1>0\}D(F(i))\{D(I)-1>0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{D5}$$

From (D5) and (D2), we have

$$T\ge \frac{1}{2}D(F(i)). \tag{D6}$$

Note that

$$\operatorname{Tr} T\le \operatorname{Tr} D(I)=\dim\mathcal{K}. \tag{D7}$$

Since $I\ge T\ge 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Tr}(\rho-e^\lambda)T\le \operatorname{Tr}(\rho-e^\lambda)\{\rho-e^\lambda\ge 0\} \\ \le&\operatorname{Tr}\rho\{\rho-e^\lambda\ge 0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{D8}$$

From (D6), (D7) and (D8), we obtain (26).

APPENDIX E: MARKOV INEQUALITY AND CRAMÉR'S THEOREM

In this section, we summarize Markov inequality and Cramér's Theorem which are applied in this paper. Let p be a probability distribution and X be a positive real valued random variable. For any real number $c>0$, we can easily prove the inequality

$$\frac{E_p(X)}{c}\ge p\{X\ge c\}, \tag{E1}$$

where E_p presents the expectation under the distribution p. This inequality is called *Markov inequality.*

This inequality can be used for large deviation evaluation as follows. Let Y be a real valued random variable. In the n-i.i.d. setting, we focus on the random variable.

$$Y^n := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i}{n},$$

where Y_i is the i-th random variable identical to Y. Applying Markov inequality for the random variable e^{tY^n}, we have

$$p^n\{Y^n\ge x\}=p^n\{e^{ntY^n}\ge e^{ntx}\}\le \frac{e^{n\phi(t)}}{e^{tx}}$$

for $t\ge 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\frac{-1}{n}\log p^n\{Y^n\ge x\}\ge tx-\phi(t),$$

where $\phi(t):=\log E_P(\exp(tY))$. Therefore,

$$\frac{-1}{n}\log p^n\{Y^n\ge x\}\ge \sup_{t\ge 0}(tx-\phi(t)). \tag{E2}$$

Conversely, the inequality

$$\lim\frac{-1}{n}\log p^n\{Y^n>x\}\le \inf_{x'>x} I(x) \tag{E3}$$

holds, where $I(x):=\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}(tx-\phi(t))$. For a proof of (E3), see Chapter II of Bucklew[26]. The pair of (E2) and (E3) is called *Cramér's Theorem.*

In the following, we discuss the case $\phi(t)$ is convex and differentiable. We define three real numbers x_1, x_2 and x_3 as

$$x_1 := \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi'(t), \quad x_2 := \lim_{t\to-\infty} \phi'(t), \quad x_3 := \phi'(0).$$

For any $x \in (x_2, x_1)$, we can uniquely define $t(x)$ as

$$x = \phi'(t(x)).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) &= xt(x) - \phi(t(x)), \quad I'(x) = t(x), \\ I''(x) &= t'(x) = \frac{1}{\phi''(t(x))}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation follows from

$$1 = \frac{dx}{dx} = t'(x)\phi''(t(x)).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-1}{n} \log p^n\{Y_n \ge x\} \\ =& \begin{cases} xt(x) - \phi(t(x)) & \text{if } x_3 \le x \le x_1 \\ +\infty & \text{if } x > x_1 \\ \phi(0) = 0 & \text{if } x < x_3 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{E4}$$

except for $x = x_1$.

[1] B. Schumacher, "Quantum coding," Phys. Rev. A, 51(4), 2738-2747, (1995).

[2] R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, "A new proof of the quantum noiseless coding theorem," J. Mod. Optics, 41(12), 2343-2349, (1994).

[3] H. Barnum, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, "General Fidelity Limit for Quantum Channels," Phys. Rev. A, 54, 4707-4711 (1996).

[4] M. Horodecki, "Limits of compression of quantum information carried by ensembles of mixed state," Phys. Rev. A, 57, 3364-3369 (1998).

[5] A. Winter, "Coding Theorems of Quantum Information Theory," Ph.D. dissertation, Uni Bielefeld, (2000). LANL eprint quant-ph/9907077, (1999).

[6] R. Jozsa, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, "Universal Quantum Information Compression," Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1714 (1998). LANL eprint quant-ph/9805017 (1998).

[7] M. Hayashi and K. Matsumoto, "Quantum universal variable-length source coding," LANL eprint quant-ph/0202001, (2002). appear in Phys. Rev. A.

[8] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, (Academic Press, New York, 1981).

[9] M. A. Nielsen and J. Kempe, "Separable States Are More Disordered Globally than Locally," Phys. Rev. Lett., 86, 5184-5187 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0011117, (2000).

[10] C. H. Bennett, "Quantum cryptography using any two nonorthogonal states," Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. 68, pp. 3121–3124, 1992.

[11] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. W. Schumacher "On quantum coding for ensembles of mixed states," LANL eprint quant-ph/0008024, (2000).

[12] D. Petz and M. Mosonyi, "Stationary quantum source coding," J. Math. Phys., **42**, 4857, (2001).

[13] H. Weyl, *The classical groups, their invariants and representations,* (Princeton, 1939).

[14] R. Goodman and N. Wallach, *Representations and Invariants of the Classical Groups,* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[15] N. Iwahori, *Taishougun to Ippansenkeigun no Hyougenron,* (Iwanami, Tokyo, 1978).(In Japanese)

[16] M. Hayashi, "Asymptotics of quantum relative entropy from a representation theoretical viewpoint," J. Phys. A: Math. and Gen. **34**, 3413-3419 (2001). LANL eprint eprint quant-ph/9704040, (1997).

[17] M. Hayashi, "Optimal sequence of POVMs in the sense of Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis,"

[18] M. Keyl and R. F. Werner, "Estimating the spectrum of a density operator," Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052311 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0102027, (2001).

[19] M. Koashi and N. Imoto "Compressibility of Mixed-State Signals," Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 017902 (2001). LANL eprint quant-ph/0103128, (2001).

[20] M. Hayashi and K. Matsumoto, "Variable length universal entanglement concentration by local operations and its application to teleportation and dense coding," LANL eprint quant-ph/0109028 (2001).

[21] M. Hayashi, M. Koashi, K. Matsumoto, F. Morikoshi and A. Winter, "Error exponents for entangle concentration," LANL eprint quant-ph/0206097 (2002).

[22] T. Ogawa and M. Hayashi, "On Error Exponents in Quantum Hypothesis Testing," LANL eprint quant-ph/0206151 (2002)

[23] R. E. Blahut, *Principles and Practice of Information Theory,* (Addison-Wesley, 1987).

[24] I. Csiszár and G. Longo, "On the error exponent for the noiseless encoding for testing simple statistical hypothesis," Studia Sci. Math. Hunger., vol 6, 181-191, (1971).

[25] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, "Strong converse and Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory,* vol.46, 2428-2433, (2000). LANL eprint quant-ph/9906090, (1999).

[26] J. A. Bucklew, *Large Deviation Techniques in Decision, Simulation and Estimation,* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990).